

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "close in time" cited in Claim 15 needs to be specifically defined.

There is no phrase "close in time" found in Claim 15. It is, in fact, found in Claim 18.

Claim 18 has been amended by replacing the phrase "close in time" with the phrase "immediately after", which is definite and clearly defined. The newly amended claim now particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter, and therefore should be allowed.

2. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 19, 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Venturini (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,317).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claims 1, 19 comprise an "attaching" step and the amended Claim 31 comprises "means to attach". This feature, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. It is neither disclosed, nor suggested by Venturini or any other cited references. Therefore, the subject matter in Claims 1, 19, 31

is patentably distinguished from the cited references and Claims 1, 19, 31 should be allowed.

The Claim 5, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention. Because Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 5 should be allowed.

Claim 6 is amended to further limit the “first server” to a “first remote server”. The subject matter “first remote server” is patently different from the cited subject matter “memory” of a mobile terminal because the memory of mobile terminal is not a remote server to the mobile terminal. Further, the amended Claim 6, which depends on independent Claim 1, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention. Therefore, Claim 6 should be allowed.

The Claim 8, which depends on the independent Claim 1, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention. Because Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 8 should also be allowed.

3. The Examiner has rejected Claims 26, 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Amin (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,307).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 26 comprises an “attaching” step which is unique to this invention. It is neither disclosed, nor suggested by Amin. The subject matter of amended Claim 26 is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. It is patentably

distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, the independent Claim 26 should be allowed.

Regarding Claim 30, as acknowledged by the examiner on page 20 paragraph 27 of the Office action: "Amin failed to teach said user profile reflects user-specifiable criteria for determining when an indicator of a device in said set of devices is to be actuated in response to a communication received for the first user." Thus, 35 U.S.C. §102(e) does not apply to Claim 30. Further, Claim 30, which depends on the amended independent Claim 26, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This feature is unique to this invention. It is neither disclosed, nor suggested by Amin and any other cited references. Because the independent Claim 26 is allowable, Claim 30 should also be allowed.

4. The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Claim 2, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by Venturini and Neustein, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 2 should also be allowed.

5. The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Neustein and further in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Claim 3, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore Claim 3 should also be allowed.

6. The Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Shull et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,363,431).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 4, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Shull, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 4 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 4 should also be allowed.

7. The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Jyogataki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,251).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited references do not suggest or teach subject matter “storing said identification code and said associations on a first remote server”. Further, Claim 7, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Jyogataki, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 7 is fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 7 should be allowed.

8. The Examiner has rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of LuPorta et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,918,158).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 9, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of LuPorta, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 9 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 9 should be allowed.

9. The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Houggy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,226).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 10, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Houggy, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 10 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 10 should be allowed.

10. The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Homan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,485).

The Applicant disagrees.

Claim 11, which depends on the amended independent Claim 1, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Homan, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 11 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 11 should be allowed.

11. The Examiner has rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 12 now comprises an "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 12 is also fully

supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 12 should be allowed.

12. The Examiner has rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Kyte (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,733).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 13 now comprises an “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 13 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 13 should be allowed.

13. The Examiner has rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini in view of Kyte and further in view of Neistein et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 14, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini in view of Kyte and further in view of Neistein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 14 is also fully supported by the disclosure and

patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 14 should be allowed.

14. The Examiner has rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte/Neistein and further in view of Neistein et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 15, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte/Neistein and further in view of Neistein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 15 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 15 should be allowed.

15. The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Shull et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,363,431).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 16, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Shull, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited

references. The subject matter of Claim 13 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 16 should be allowed.

16. The Examiner has rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Venturini et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,317).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 17, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Venturini, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 13 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 17 should be allowed.

17. The Examiner has rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Houggy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,226).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 18, which depends on the amended independent Claim 13, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in

Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Houggy, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 13 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 18 should be allowed.

18. The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 20 comprises a component "means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 20 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 20 should be allowed.

19. The Examiner has rejected Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein and in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 21, which depends on the amended independent Claim 20, now also comprises the "means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a

user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 21 is fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 21 should be allowed.

20. The Examiner has rejected Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein and in view of Shull et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,363,431).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 22, which depends on the amended independent Claim 20, now also comprises the "means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Shull, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 22 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 22 should be allowed.

21. The Examiner has rejected Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein/Shull and in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 23, which depends on the amended Claim 20, now also comprises the "means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein/Shull and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 23 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 23 should be allowed.

22. The Examiner has rejected Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,733).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 24, which depends on the amended Claim 20, now also comprises the "means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 24 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 24 should be allowed.

23. The Examiner has rejected Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,733).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended Claim 25, which depends on the amended Claim 20, now also comprises the “means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified” which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Neustein and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 25 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 25 should be allowed.

24. The Examiner has rejected Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and further in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 27, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 27 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 27 should be allowed.

25. The Examiner has rejected Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin/Neustein and further in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 28, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin/Neustein and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 28 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 28 should be allowed.

26. The Examiner has rejected Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and in view of Kyte et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,733).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 29, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the “attaching” step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 29 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 29 should be allowed.

27. The Examiner has rejected Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amin and in view of Amin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,307).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 30, which depends on the amended Claim 26, now also comprises the "attaching" step which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Amin and in view of Amin, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 30 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 30 should be allowed.

28. The Examiner has rejected Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and in view of Kyte et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,733).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 32, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the limitation "wherein said indication device containing a means for easily attaching said device to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini and in view of Kyte, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 32 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 32 should be allowed.

29. The Examiner has rejected Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Houggy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,226).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 33, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the limitation "wherein said indication device containing a means for easily attaching said device to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and in view of Houggy, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 33 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 33 should be allowed.

30. The Examiner has rejected Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini/Kyte and further in view of Homan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,485).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 34, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the limitation "wherein said indication device containing a means for easily attaching said device to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini/Kyte and in view of Homan, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 34 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 34 should be allowed.

31. The Examiner has rejected Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini and in view of Neustein (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 35, which depends on the amended Claim 31, now also comprises the limitation "wherein said indication device containing a means for easily attaching said device to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified" which is unique to this invention and cannot be found in Venturini and in view of Neustein, nor is it taught or suggested by these cited references. The subject matter of Claim 35 is also fully supported by the disclosure and patentably distinguished from the cited references. Therefore, Claim 35 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers this invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the objections and rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the this application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862

MARK-UP OF AMENDMENTS

In the claims:

1. A method of indicating receipt of a communication, comprising:
registering a first message-indicating device for a user, said device comprising an indicator;
receiving notification of receipt of a first communication directed to the user;
attaching said device to a location from which said indicator can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated; and
initiating a first wireless signal to said device;
wherein in response to said first signal, said indicator activates to alert the user.

6. The method of claim 5, further comprising:
storing said identification code and said associations on a first remote server;
and
configuring said first remote server to automatically initiate said first wireless signal to said device in response to notification of receipt of one of said one or more types of communications.

7. The method of claim 5, further comprising:
storing said identification code and said associations on a first remote server;
receiving from the user a selection of one or more criteria identifying when said first signal should be sent in response to receipt of a first type of communication; and
configuring said first remote server to automatically initiate said first wireless signal to said device when:
it is determined that said first type of communication is received for the user; and
said one or more criteria are satisfied.

12. A method of using a message-waiting device to notify a user of receipt of a communication for the user, the method comprising:

receiving a communication directed to a user;

initiating a first electronic signal to a first message-waiting device associated with the user, wherein said first message-waiting device includes an indicator and said first electronic signal is configured to activate said indicator;

attaching said device to a location from which said indicator can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated;

providing said communication to said user; and

after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator.

13. A method of indicating receipt of a communication, comprising:

receiving a first wireless signal at a first message-indicating device, wherein said first device includes an alarm;

attaching said device to a location from which said alarm can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated;

activating said alarm in response to said first wireless signal; and

deactivating said alarm;

wherein receipt of said first wireless signal indicates that a first communication was directed to a user of said first device.

18. The method of claim 17, further comprising:

registering a second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of said multiple types of communications;

receiving a first wireless signal at said second message-indicating device [close in time to] immediately after said receipt of said first wireless signal at said first device, wherein said second device includes an alarm; and

activating said alarm of said second device in response to said first wireless signal.

19. A computer readable storage medium storing instructions that, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform a method of indicating receipt of a communication, the method comprising:

registering a first message-indicating device for a user, said device comprising an indicator;

receiving notification of receipt of a first communication directed to the user; attaching said device to a location from which said indicator can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated; and

initiating a first wireless signal to said device;

wherein in response to said first signal, said indicator activates to alert the user.

20. A portable apparatus for indicating receipt of a communication, comprising:

a signal receiver configured to receive a first wireless signal generated after receipt of a communication[; and]

an indicator configured to activate in response to receipt of said first signal; and a means for easily attaching said apparatus to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified;

wherein said indicator is configured to deactivate in response to a second signal.

26. A method of indicating a communication waiting status for a user, comprising:

receiving notification of a first communication for a first user;

accessing a user profile of the first user, said user profile identifying a set of

communication waiting indication devices associated with the first user, wherein each device in said set of devices comprises an indicator;

attaching each of said devices to a location from which said indicator of each device in said set of devices can be easily and quickly observed, accessed or manipulated;

identifying a subset of said communication waiting indication devices based on said first communication; and

initiating a first wireless signal to said subset of devices, wherein in response to said first wireless signal said indicators of said subset of devices are actuated.

31. A communication waiting indication system comprising:

a first communication waiting indication device associated with a first user, said first device comprising an alarm; and

a notification server configured to issue a first wireless signal toward said first device in response to receipt of a first communication for the first user;

wherein said indication device containing a means for easily attaching said device to a location where a user can be easily and quickly notified; and

wherein in response to said first wireless signal, said alarm is activated.

32. The system of claim 31, wherein said first device has an identification code, further comprising:

a first remote server configured to store said identification code in association with a first user profile for the first user;

wherein said first user profile is configured to identify one or more types of communication, including said first communication, in response to which said first wireless signal is to be initiated toward said first device.